



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,953	01/16/2004	Albert C. Brown	SVL920065008US3	6170
47069 7590 02/25/2008 KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP ATTN: IBM54 315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE, SUITE 210 BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212				
EXAMINER WHIPPLE, BRIAN P				
ART UNIT 2152		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 02/25/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/758,953

**Applicant(s)**

BROWN ET AL.

**Examiner**

Brian P. Whipple

**Art Unit**

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-50 and 52-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-50 and 52-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/12/07.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-16, 18-50, 52-56 are pending in this application and presented for examination. Claims 17 and 51 were cancelled by Applicant's amendment filed on 12/3/07.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the arguments being directed to amended subject matter and in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Claim Objections***

3. As to claim 1, line 12, the phrase "the web content manger" may be intended to read "the web content manager."

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 4-11, 13-16, 18-23, 25-50, and 52-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challenger et al. (Challenger), submitted by the applicant (item 20 in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on 8/18/04), in view of what was well known in the art.

6. As to claim 1, Challenger discloses a system for managing electronic content on a computer network, the system comprising:

an electronic content library configured to store a plurality of files (Pg. 847, § B.2, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ln. 8-10; Pg. 848, Fig. 6);

a web content manager configured to publish one or more of the files stored in the electronic content library to a website, wherein the web content manager is configured to manage information available on a website (Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 5, ln. 13-14 and 20-21; Pg. 849, Fig. 7);

an enterprise content management system configured to check-out a selected file from the electronic content library upon a user's request (Pg. 847, § B.1, ¶ 4, ln. 7-10; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 5, ln. 13-14 and 20-21; Pg. 849, Fig. 7; Additionally, it is inherent that the finished webpages served by the Web Server of Fig. 7 will receive requests from clients to display the corresponding webpage.), and to check-in an updated version of the selected file to the electronic content library (Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Pg.

849, Fig. 7), such that checking-in the updated version of the selected files causes the data in the electronic content library to be updated (Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Pg. 849, Fig. 7), wherein the enterprise content management system is linked to the web content manger (Fig. 7) and includes the electronic content library (Pg. 847, § B.2, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ln. 8-10; Pg. 848, Fig. 6; Fig. 7), and wherein the enterprise content management system provides revision history (Pg. 847, § B.1, ¶ 5, ln. 8-13; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Fig. 6; Fig. 7); and

an event trigger subsystem in the enterprise content management system configured to notify the web content manager of the updated version of the selected file in response to a modification to the selected file (Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Pg. 849, Fig. 7; Specifically, the Trigger Monitor tracks modification, deletion, and addition; and publishes data to Web Server.).

Challenger's teachings include tracking pending fragments awaiting publishing as part of a webpage and certain fragments require that a proofreader approve fragments prior to publication (Pg. 844, ¶ 7, ln. 1-5; Pg. 847, § B.1, ¶ 4, ln. 7-10). It may be argued that tracking pending fragments to an existing webpage is revision history data. However, Challenger does not appear to explicitly teach this in the embodiment of keeping a history of previous versions of a webpage following updating of the webpage.

However, Official Notice is taken that this is a well-known part of the networking, and specifically web development, field. For example, the Wayback Machine (<http://www.archive.org/web/web.php>) is a service that can be used to display a history of old versions of webpages and to view the webpages. Additionally, logging changes to a webpage is standard practice for many web administrators. This is seen at sites such as Wikipedia.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challenger by using the well known practice of maintaining revision history data for purposes such as allowing a user to display old versions of a webpage to see changes and to allow a user or administrator to roll back undesired changes to a webpage.

7. As to claim 4, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above (Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Pg. 849, Fig. 7; Specifically, the Trigger Monitor tracks modification, deletion, and addition; and publishes data to Web Server.).

8. As to claim 5, Challenger and what was well known in the art disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, including the event trigger subsystem also triggers an approval subsystem configured to notify a user authorized to approve changes that the

Art Unit: 2152

updated version of the selected file has been checked-in to the electronic content library

(Challenger: Pg. 844, ¶ 7, ln. 1-5; Pg. 847, § B.1, ¶ 4, ln. 7-10; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 5, ln. 13-14 and 20-21; Pg. 849, Fig. 7).

9. As to claims 6, 40, and 44, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. It may be interpreted that Challenger and what is well known in the art disclose non-web-based data. Proofreaders may reject content proposed for publication to the web (Challenger: Pg. 844, ¶ 7, ln. 1-5.)

10. As to claims 7, 16, 25-27, 33-35, 37, 46-47, and 50, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above (Challenger: Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Pg. 849, Fig. 7; Specifically, the Trigger Monitor tracks modification, deletion, and addition; and publishes data to Web Server.).

11. As to claims 11, 31, and 44, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above (See the discussion of the inherency versus obviousness, in view of what is well known in the art, for revision history data).

12. As to claim 36, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above (Challenger: Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Pg. 849, Fig. 7; Specifically, the Trigger Monitor tracks modification, deletion, and addition; and publishes data to Web Server; See the discussion of the inherency versus obviousness, in view of what is well known in the art, for revision history data.)

13. As to claim 8, Challenger and what was well known in the art disclose the invention substantially as in the parent claim, including the web-based electronic content comprises computer files containing multimedia data (Challenger: Pg. 850, Fig. 8).

14. As to claim 9, Challenger does not explicitly disclose metadata, but Official Notice is taken that metadata is well known in the networking, and specifically the web development, field as a means of expressing, for example, data about data contained in a webpage, such as topic of interest.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challenger by explicitly disclosing the content comprising files containing metadata as is well known in the art for the purpose of expressing data about data contained in a webpage.



15. As to claims 10 and 41-43, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 8 above.

16. As to claims 13 and 38, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 4 above.

17. As to claims 14, 21-23, 32, 39, 48, and 55-56, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 5 above.

18. As to claim 45, the claim is rejected for similar reasons to claim 2-3 and 5 above.

19. As to claim 15, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. The plurality of Trigger Monitors comprises a first content processor for managing the published and non-published electronic content (Pg. 844, ¶ 7, ln. 1-5; Pg. 847, § B.1, ¶ 4, ln. 7-10; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 5, ln. 13-14 and 20-21; Pg. 849, Fig. 7) and a second content processor for managing the publication of the published electronic content (Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Pg. 849, Fig. 7; Specifically, the Trigger Monitor tracks modification, deletion, and addition; and publishes data to Web Server.) Challenger discloses the second content processor is a web content manager and is linked to the first content processor and is configured to manage information available on a website (Pg. 849, Fig. 7).

20. As to claim 18, Challenger and what is well known in the art disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 15. Challenger appears to be silent on the webpages being Internet webpages. However, Official Notice is taken that Internet webpages are extremely well known in the art. In fact, they are the standard method for presenting webpages to other users.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challenger by publishing webpages to the Internet as is extremely well known in the art, as frequently it is desired to have users across numerous different networks access a published webpage, for purposes such as dissemination of information and/or advertising.

21. As to claim 19, Challenger and what is well known in the art disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 15. Challenger appears to be silent on the webpages being intranet webpages. However, Official Notice is taken that intranet webpages are extremely well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challenger by publishing webpages to an intranet as is

extremely well known in the art, for the purpose of limiting webpages to an internal network if information is sensitive, private, or irrelevant to external users.

22. As to claim 20, Challenger discloses the publication related activity comprises publishing the changed electronic content on a website, and checking the integrity of the website (Pg. 844, ¶ 7, ln. 5-8).

23. As to claims 28-30 and 41-43, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 8-10 above.

24. As to claim 49, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 15 above.

25. As to claims 52-53, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 18-19 above.

26. As to claim 54, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 20 above.

27. Claims 2-3 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challenger and what was well known in the art as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of Yuen et al. (Yuen), U.S. Publication No. 2003/0033037 A1.

28. As to claim 2, Challenger and what was well known in the art disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, including the event trigger subsystem is further configured to enable selected content manager functions when the selected file is checked-out of the electronic content library (Challenger: Pg. 849, Fig. 7), but are silent on determining that a user is authorized to check-out the selected file from the electronic content library using user authorization content, based on permissions stored in the user authorization content.

However, Yuen discloses determining that a user is authorized to check-out the selected file from the electronic content library using user authorization content, based on permissions stored in the user authorization content (Fig. 7; [0045]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challenger and what was well known in the art by including user authorization as taught by Yuen in order to ensure that undesirable users are not granted access to files that should be reserved for trusted users.

29. As to claim 3, Challenger and what was well known in the art disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, but are silent on disabling selected content manager functions when the selected file is checked-out of the electronic content library and determining that a user is authorized to check-out the selected file from the electronic

content library using user authorization content, based on permissions stored in the user authorization content.

However, Yuen discloses disabling selected content manager functions when the selected file is checked-out of the electronic content library ([0046], ln. 17-22) and determining that a user is authorized to check-out the selected file from the electronic content library using user authorization content, based on permissions stored in the user authorization content (Fig. 7; [0045]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challenger and what was well known in the art at the time of the invention by disabling selected content manager functions when the selected file is checked-out of the electronic content library as taught by Yuen in order to prevent users from modifying a file simultaneously, as this could lead to ambiguity or conflicts and errors in the modified file, as well as being a nuisance and source of confusion to the users attempting to edit the file simultaneously; and modifying Challenger and what was well known in the art at the time of the invention by including user authorization as taught by Yuen in order to ensure that undesirable users are not granted access to files that should be reserved for trusted users.

30. As to claim 12, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 3 above.

31. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challenger and what was well known in the art as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Norin et al. (Norin), U.S. Patent No. 5,794,253.

32. As to claim 24, Challenger and what was well known in the art disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 15, including the publication related activity comprises publishing the changed electronic content (Challenger: Pg. 844, ¶ 7, ln. 1-8), but are silent on notifying a workgroup of changes in the published electronic content.

However, Norin discloses notifying a workgroup of changes in the published electronic content (Col. 1, ln. 7-11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challenger and what was well known in the art by notifying a workgroup of changes in the published electronic content as taught by Norin in order to ensure synchronization of data objects and prevent data loss through replication (Col. 1, ln. 60 – Col. 2, ln. 2).

### ***Conclusion***

33. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

34. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian P. Whipple whose telephone number is (571)270-1244. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30 AM to 5:00 PM EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2152

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brian P. Whipple  
/B. P. W./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2152  
2/17/08

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152